



The Task Force on Court Facilities
455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102-3660

South Planning Committees Meeting Report
Wednesday, March 02, 2000 8:30 AM

Napa Valley Marriott
3425 Solono Avenue
Napa, CA

ATTENDEES: SOUTH COMMITTEE MEMBERS: PRESENT: Mr. John Clarke Hon. Wayne Peterson Ms. Yvonne Campos Mr. Wylie Aitken Hon. Daniel Kremer ABSENT: Mr. Hector De La Torre Mr. Charles Smith GUESTS: Mr. John Van Whervin Mr. Joseph Fallin	CONSULTANTS TO THE TASK FORCE: Mr. Andrew Cupples, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Mendenhall Mr. Simon Park, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Mendenhall Mr. Alton Chow, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, & Mendenhall TASK FORCE STAFF: Mr. Bruce Newman, Facilities Planner, AOC
--	---

I. OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Clarke welcomed the committee members and opened the meeting shortly after 8:00.

II. OLD BUSINESS

The Minutes from Committee Mtg. #1 in were approved with suggestions for minor corrections.

III. MEETING SCHEDULE

The next committee meeting will occur on April 19th in San Diego. Committee meeting #4 is to be held in conjunction with the Task Force meeting #11.

III. COUNTY PRESENTATIONS

Andy Cupples and Simon Park presented an overview of the current facilities, comparing the state of existing facilities to future needs for the following counties:

Los Angeles County – Simon Park presented an update on the survey progress to date along with issues related to planning methodology for Los Angeles County.

- To date, field survey for Northeast District and Central District has been completed in addition to Southwest and North-Central Districts. Detailed building evaluations were not presented.
- Mr. Park suggested developing “District” based planning options that can be rolled-up into County Level planning options. This suggestion was made as a way of managing the magnitude of the Los Angeles court system as well as the large geographic scale of the county.
- Mr. Clarke mentioned that all court districts in Los Angeles County are currently developing case management plans and suggested that we evaluate the case management plans as they are completed prior to developing “District” based planning options.
- Mr. Park listed the East District and West District as the next districts to be surveyed and concluded the presentation of Los Angeles Counties’ survey status.

Action:

- Consultant to proceed with survey of the county.
- Los Angeles Superior Court to provide consultants the district-based Case Management Plans for use in district-based analysis of planning options.
- The survey team, Mr. Clarke and his staff to hold meetings to discuss Los Angeles County planning methodology.

San Bernardino County – Simon Park

- San Bernardino is geographically the largest county in the U.S. with the main population concentration in the southwest corner of the county. The population is as follows:
 - 1999 – 1,734,500 people
 - 2020 – 3,095,800 people
- There are currently ten judicial courts with a total of 83 courtrooms. The largest growth has been reported to be in the Western and Central Districts of the county. Issues of inmate transfers have been noted to be in excess of \$10 million per year. The County has a recently completed Master Plan for its court facilities which primarily is based on projections to Year 2010. Mr. Park reported that the survey team’s findings closely coincide with planning options presented in the recently completed County Master Plan.

Key Planning Goals:

- The county court system will focus on developing three regional centers – Central, Western, and High Desert. The development of regional centers will be at the following locations.
 - Central District – Central Courthouse
 - Western District – Rancho Cucamonga Courthouse
 - High Desert District – Victorville Courthouse

- While the regional centers will develop into full service courts, the small court facilities in the outlying regions will operate as non-criminal court facilities with main emphasis on providing “Access” to justice system.
- It has been reported that in 1998, 479,059 cases were filed and by the year 2020 an expected increase will be at 799,503 cases. Judicial positions have been estimated to have an increase of approximately 50 positions by the year 2020.

Summary of Options:

Planning Option A: This option is based on developing three regional justice centers, namely Central, High Desert and West Valley Regional Centers while using all other existing court facilities mainly to provide access to court systems and to handle non-criminal cases. Key suggested actions include renovating the existing central courthouse for 18 non-criminal courtrooms while adding 24 new courtrooms for criminal proceedings. Addition of 14 courtrooms at each of High Desert and West Valley Regional Centers for civil and family proceedings are part of Option A.

Planning Option B: This option is also based on developing the three regional justice centers. Unlike Option A, this option suggests abandoning the existing Central Court (Historic & Annex) for a new 42 courtroom facility. All others regional and local facilities development are as suggested in Option A.

The committee directed the consultant to complete the documentation and forward to the County and Local Court for review and comment.

As part of the review of San Bernardino, the Committee revisited several issues relative to the methodology. The consultant team clarified several issues related to the methodology and terminology. These clarifications have been added to Section 1 of the report. The committee also suggested that all findings be presented in an active tense as opposed to a passive one, since the findings are in fact the result of actual surveys, not simply a compilation of comments offered by others.

Action:

- Consultant to proceed with documenting options and forward to County for review
- Consultant to complete the documentation and forward to the County and Local Court for review and comment.

Alpine County – Andy Cupples presented a report of the findings done on the survey completed on Alpine County. The following were the findings.

- The county has already gone through unification.
- The county has a small population base.
- The eastern portion of the county is inaccessible during the winter due to road closure through the Sierras.
- Currently the county has two Judicial FTE's due to former Municipal and Superior Court jurisdictions, which are shared with other counties.
- There is a single courthouse in Markleeville with one courtroom.
- The courtroom is jury capable but has no secure or private circulation.
- Issues of using a circuit judge have been considered as a discussion.

Summary of Options:

- The primary option identified was to utilize the existing courthouse with relocation of court-related and non-court functions as required to accommodate support needs.

Action:

- Consultant to proceed with documenting options and forward to County for review
- Subsequent to the presentation, it was discovered that due to an administrative oversight and/or scheduling difficulties, that the County Administrator did not participate in the initial interview process. Documentation of the findings and options is being held in abeyance, pending completion of this interview and subsequent re-evaluation of the options if required.

Mono County – Andy Cupples presented a report of the findings done on the survey completed on Mono County. The following were the findings.

- Currently the county has a facility in Bridgeport and one in Mammoth Lakes. Both courthouses have two courtrooms each. The original judicial center was focused on Bridgeport but due to the population growth of the Mammoth area a shift has occurred. The following are three plans given:

Summary of Options:

- Have a bi-polar system in which both courthouses are full service and act independent from each other.
- Have an additional facility in-between both cities, which will act as a central location with the other two locations being geared more towards community service.
- Construct a new facility in Mammoth and use the Bridgeport location as a satellite court.

Action:

- Consultant to proceed with documenting options and forward to County for review
- Subsequent to the presentation, it was discovered that due to an administrative oversight and/or scheduling difficulties, that the County Administrator did not participate in the initial interview process. Documentation of the findings and options is being held in abeyance, pending completion of this interview and subsequent re-evaluation of the options if required.

Inyo County – Andy Cupples presented a report of the findings done on the survey completed on Inyo County. The following were the findings.

- Currently the county has two facilities, one in Bishop housing one courtroom, and one in Independence, which houses three courtrooms. Although the county seat has been located in Independence, the majority of the population has grown more in the Bishop area. It was also noted that there was a significant change in elevation between the two facilities. The following four proposals were given:

Summary of Options:

- Construct a new facility in between and have the other existing courts act as satellite facilities to the new main facility.
- Centralize either court and make the other a satellite court.
- Bisect the county and expand both facilities into full service courts.

- The committee raised another approach for consideration in the long-term. Mono & Inyo, share a common border and both counties are experiencing growth near that border (Mono in the southern part of the county around Mammoth and Inyo in the Northern part of the county around Bishop). A cost effective approach (both in terms of facilities and operational costs) may be the construction of a common facility to serve both counties, with the court space in the county seats remaining as a “satellite”.

Action:

- Consultant to proceed with documenting options and forward to County for review, including common facility as an additional option.
- Subsequent to the presentation, it was discovered that due to an administrative oversight and/or scheduling difficulties, that the County Administrator did not participate in the initial interview process. Documentation of the findings and options is being held in abeyance, pending completion of this interview and subsequent re-evaluation of the options if required.

NEXT MEETING

Committee members raised three issues for further review with the Task Force or as part of a joint north/south committee meeting:

- Wylie Aitken and Yvonne Campos requested a review of evaluation process and basis for scoring.
- Judge Peterson and Jack Clarke requested that the two committees or the Task Force as a whole discuss a common approach to addressing options for “regionalization” or other approaches to service delivery that would enhance service while mitigating the need for facilities and future growth.
- Judge Peterson requested a full Task Force discussion regarding the development Phase 5 efforts in terms of finance and implementation issues as they related to planning recommendations.

CLOSING REMARKS

John Clarke called the meeting to a close at approximately 12:00 pm. Next meeting was originally scheduled for April 12, 1999 at the Appellate Court in San Diego, but was subsequently rescheduled to April 19, 1999, (location unchanged) due to schedule conflicts of several committee members.